From:	Dean Matt
To:	Steve Heitzner; Scott Huebner; Greg Selep; Steve Swanson
Cc:	Vivian Carvalho; Kevin Plenzler; Michelle Cocita; Rob Schlingmann; Marisa Powers; Kwame Jackson
Subject:	Re: On the subject of Special benefits.
Date:	Thursday, July 16, 2026 2:10:45 PM

ALERT: This message is from an external source.BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any link or attachment

Forgot:

If the projected property values for the next several years are less than 2.4%. [or even negative] would that change PFM's conclusion that our properties can bear the proposed assessment?

I hope you agree these are fair questions based on the explanation given. I hope you ask and get an answer from PFM. I just don't understand their logic. If you do, then please articulate. If you don't, then please ask.

Thank you.

Dean Matt
630.248.0646

The 48-48-48 Pickleball Challenge:
Https://Mucho-Dean-Aero.com/the-pickleball-challenge

Gone To Pot book: Https://GoneToPotBook.com

GolfGearGolf Accessories:
Https://GolfGear.Golf

On Jul 16, 2026, at 13:45, muchodeanaero@aol.com wrote:

I came across this in the agenda for the 7/17 meeting.

Can you have PFM explain this section for the benefit of you all as Supervisors for your due diligence in understanding exactly what they are saying and asserting and for Residents please. Seriously....it behooves all of us to understand this. I never have.

Questions:

1. Specifically what are they referring to when they conclude: "it is clear the improvement and enhancement in recreational facilities will confer a special benefit on the properties that will bear the assessment."
    1. Are they saying that as long as the average assessment (2.4%) as a percentage of market value is less than a 55.9% ***historical*** property value appreciation, this demonstrates the properties can bear the assessment?
        1. What does historical growth rate have to do with a future assessment?
    2. Certainly, they can't be insinuating that homes can bear an assessment up to 55.9% of the property value. Is this what they are inferring?
    3. It seems that they have not taken into account the already existing assessment. Do they need to?

As you know...I never understood their statement here. I believe that Supervisors and residents are owed a more detailed, logical explanation as this one doesn't seem to have a logical association between a historical growth rate and the benefits provided by a future assessment for various capital projects.

It seems to me that they need to demonstrate that the special benefits conferred by these planned capital projects confer a benefit in excess of their cost. I hope you agree that what they provided avoids addressing this.

I hope you agree that as part of your due diligence that UPRD is owed an explanation here. What they provided doesn't seem to support what they are asserting. Are Supervisors and residents supposed to sign up for this "leap of faith?"

<Screenshot 2026-07-16 132409.jpg>

Dean Matt

aka MuchoDeanAero
aka The Pickleball Pilot
630.248.0646

MuchoDeanAero - aviation adventures and the home of The World Record 48-48-48 Pickleball Challenge

Golf Gear **-** *golf accessories*
Gone to Pot Book - *cannabis industry non-fiction*
<Screenshot 2026-07-16 132409.jpg>